IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

ARBITRATION PETITION(Lodg) NO.386 OF 2005

Shradha Chandrashekar Hingarh ... Petitioner

vs.

Madukanta Bhogibhai Shah and another. .... Respondents.

Mr.Arif Bookwala i/b. Mohit Gadkari & Co, for Petitioner.

Mr. Anil C. Singh, for Respondents.

AND

ARBITRATION PETITION(Lodg) NO.367 OF 2005
(NOT ON BOARD)

Madhukanta Bhogilal Shah @ Jhobalia and another. ... Petitioners

vs.

Jeevan Motilal Ranka and another. .... Respondents.

Mr. Anil C. Singh, for Petitioners.

Mr.Arif Bookwala i/b. Mohit Gadkari & Co, for Respondents.

CORAM: D.K.DESHMUKH,J.

DATED: 2nd August,2005

P.C.:-

1. By consent of parties, the disputes between the parties including the dispute about existence of second development agreement are referred to the sole Arbitrator Shri.Dinyar D. Madan, Advocate having address at Jeru Building, 2nd floor, M.G.Road, Mumbai-400023.

2. Parties are directed to maintain status quo in relation to the suit property for the period of Eight weeks from today, with liberty to both the parties to move before the learned Arbitrator for appropriate interim relief.

3. All the contentions available to both the parties are kept open to be raised before the learned Arbitrator.

The learned Counsel for Respondents in Arbitration Petition (Lodging) no.386 of 2005 states that the petitioner in that petition was allowed to enter upon the suit building for the purpose of carrying out the construction. The statement is accepted.

The learned Counsel for Petitioner in the Arbitration petition (Lodging) no.386 of 2005 states that the petitioner shall not carry out further construction without obtaining appropriate interim order from the learned Arbitrator. The statement is accepted.

Both the petitions are disposed of.

The petitioner in Arbitration Petition (lodg) no.386 of 2005

to communicate the order to the learned Arbitrator.